

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 29-57 were pending in the application, of which Claims 29, 36, 44 and 52 are independent. In the Office Action dated June 21, 2005, Claims 29-35 and 52-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and Claims 36-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claim 41 was objected to. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's rejections in turn.

### **1. Change to Attorney Docket Number**

Please note that the Attorney Docket Number for this application is now **60197.0001USU01**. Applicant respectfully requests that future correspondence contain the new Attorney Docket Number.

### **2. Response To Rejection of Claims 29-35 and 52-57 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 29-35 and 52-57 are rejected as allegedly being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,880 ("the '880 patent). Claims 29 and 52 are independent. Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the following amendments and remarks.

Claim 29 as amended is generally directed to a method for authorizing execution of an object on a computer system by selecting an executable object on the computer system; inserting a first identifier into a steganographic zone of the object, wherein the first identifier and the stenographic zone of the object are formed by the computer system and the first identifier prevents execution of the executable object; and comparing the first identifier in the steganographic zone to a second identifier each time the object is selected for execution, wherein an executable version of the object is created if the first identifier matches the second identifier.

Amended Claim 29 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, inserting a first identifier into a steganographic zone of an executable object, wherein the first identifier and the stenographic zone of the

object are formed by the computer system and the first identifier prevents execution of the executable object.

The '880 patent fails to anticipate claim 29 for at least the reason that the '880 patent does not disclose a computer system that inserts a first identifier into an executable object present on the computer system, wherein the first identifier prevents execution of the object. The '880 patent discloses placing an identifier on the surface of a product or on the wrapping of a product. The user is then prompted to input a product identifier which is matched to the identifier on the product. Applicant respectfully submits that the '880 patent does not disclose inserting a unique identifier into an executable object.

The '880 patent also fails to disclose a method in which the first identifier is compared to a second identifier each time the object is selected for execution. Nor does the '880 patent disclose a method in which an executable version of the object is created by the computer system if the first identifier matches the second identifier. Accordingly, Applicant submits the rejection is overcome with regard to claim 29 and its dependent claims.

Claim 52 as amended is generally directed to a method for creation of authorized objects of a computer system including selecting an executable object for authorization; retrieving a system identifier from a storage device; embedding the selected object with the system identifier wherein the system identifier prevents execution of the object; storing data for retrieving the system identifier from the object on the storage device and generating an executable copy of the object each time the object is selected for execution if the first identifier matches the second identifier.

Applicant respectfully submits that the '880 patent does not anticipate claim 52 for at least the reason that the '880 patent fails to disclose embedding the selected executable object with the system identifier wherein the system identifier prevents execution of the object. Additionally, the '880 patent fails to disclose a method including generating an executable copy of the object each time the object is selected for execution if the first identifier matches the second identifier. Because the '880 patent

fails to disclose each element of claim 52, the '880 patent cannot anticipate claim 52 or claims dependent on claim 52. Applicant submits the rejection is overcome.

**2. Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 36-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the '880 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,919,257 to Trostle (the '257 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

To establish a prime facie case of obviousness there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Additionally, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reason that the combination of the cited references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Claim 36 is independent and is generally directed to a method for identifying unauthorized objects on a computer system by authorizing objects of the computer system by embedding a system identifier into the authorized objects; determining the presence of the system identifier in objects of the computer, wherein objects that are not embedded with the system identifier are unauthorized; and isolating unauthorized objects from the computer system.

Claim 44 is independent and is generally directed to a method for authorizing objects of a computer system by selecting a set of objects for authorization; generating a system identifier, wherein the system identifier is generated by the computer system using object fields; embedding the selected objects with the system identifier; storing the system identifier; determining the presence of the system identifier on objects on the computer system; comparing detected system identifiers on the objects of the computer system with the stored system identifier; and isolating objects without a detectable system identifier or with a system identifier that does not match the stored system identifier.

The Office Action acknowledges that the '880 patent fails to teach or suggest at least the step of isolating unauthorized objects from the computer system. The '257 patent is cited as allegedly curing this deficiency. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Column 7, lines 28-42 of the '257 patent provides:

Referring again to FIG. 4, in step 89 the workstation compares a computed hash value against the trusted hash value. If the values are equal then illicit changes have not been made to the selected executables programs, and execution continues with step 90 which returns workstation execution to the system BIOS. Otherwise, step 92 is performed to notify the user, and/or the network system administrator, that an unauthorized change has been detected. The workstation may also make an entry in an audit server audit log and/or download a "clean" copy of the executable program which was detected to have the illicit change. In step 94 the workstation operating system software is loaded from the server, and the user login and authentication process is completed in step 96.

Applicant respectfully submits that this passage cited by the Examiner does not teach or suggest isolating unauthorized objects from the computer system. Instead, this passage teaches that if an unauthorized change is detected, the system notifies the user and/or the network system administrator. A "clean" copy of the executable program may be downloaded; however, the '257 patent fails to teach or suggest isolating the unauthorized executable program. Thus, the combination of the references fails to teach or suggest at least this element of independent claims 36 and 44 and cannot render these claims or their dependent claims obvious. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


### **3. Response To The Objection of Claim 41**

The Office Action objected to Claim 41 because it is allegedly unclear. Claim 41 is amended to address these informalities and clarify the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this objection and adds no new matter.

### CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicant asserts that the pending claims 29-57 are in condition for allowance. The claims have not been amended for reasons related to patentability, but are amended to expedite the allowance of this case. Applicant further asserts that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application with claims 29-57 to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview with Applicant's attorney would further advance the case, please contact Applicant's attorney at 404.954.5061.

Respectfully submitted,  
**MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC**



Charles Vorndran  
Reg. No. 45,315

Merchant & Gould  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946  
Telephone: 404.954.5100

**23552**